BLM LIBRARY
88068121

RANGELAND
PROGRAM
SUMMARY

GLENWOOD SPRINGS RESOURCE AREA

HD
243
.C6
G54
1984

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
GRAND JUNCTION DISTRICT
COLORADO MAY 1984

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 50, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

F902740560

ID 88068121

HD
243
.C6
G54
1984

FOREWORD

It is my pleasure to make available to you the rangeland program summary for the rangeland management program for the Glenwood Springs Resource Area. This document summarizes livestock grazing decisions made in our recently completed resource management plan. It should be used in conjunction with that plan.

The benefits to be derived from the implementation of this program are within the concept of mutiple use, maintaining a viable livestock industry and ensuring benefits for wildlife, watershed, and related resources as they exist on federal rangelands.

This document explains the process for implementation of the livestock grazing management program and the opportunities for additional public involvement. Periodic updates to this document will summarize actions taken and progress toward achieving planning objectives.

I appreciate the support and assistance given to the resource area from various groups, individuals, and local governments who have a vital interest in the management of these public lands.

Area Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Glenwood Springs Resource Area
P. O. Box 1009
Glenwood Springs, Colorado 81602

May, 1984
Date

ITEM HAS BEEN DIGITIZED

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION....1

RELATION OF RANGELAND PROGRAM SUMMARY TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS...3

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN DECISIONS....5
- Selective Management Categories....5
- Stocking Rates and Grazing Decisions....6
- Allotment Management Plan Development....8
- Monitoring....9

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT....13

APPENDIXES....15
1. Livestock Use and Monitoring Studies by Category and Allotment......15
2. Selective Management Category Criteria....27

INTRODUCTION

This rangeland program summary (RPS) summarizes the livestock grazing management program and grazing decisions reached through the Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan (RMP) and consultation with affected parties. It describes which selective management category each allotment falls into and gives a proposed schedule for issuing grazing decisions on allotments where supplemental information is not needed. It also describes the studies and actions to be taken so that decisions can be reached on allotments where additional information is needed.

This RPS will be updated periodically to report progress and to document changes from the grazing program described herein. The first update will be published approximately 1 year following this document.

One hundred sixty-eight operators graze livestock on the 253 allotments in the resource area. The sizes of the allotments vary from 7 to 14,642 acres of public lands; active preferences range from 3 to 3,963 animal-unit months (AUMs). The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) currently authorizes 56,885 AUMs of grazing use each year. About 37,500 AUMs are licensed for active use, and the remainder are authorized for non-use. This active use supplies about 7 percent of the total forage needs for these operators.

Although livestock production has been replaced by recreation and tourism as the major economic activity, it still retains an important role in the area. In addition to the reliance placed on it by ranch families, livestock production gives the area a rural western character that attracts tourists. Ranches are viewed by some residents as an effective buffer between resort areas and energy development areas. For many ranchers, the use of BLM rangeland during a particular season of the year is vital to their operation. Moreover, much of the area's big game population relies on crucial winter range located on ranchland that may be suitable for development.

Based on 1978 statistics, 5.3 percent of the over 25,000 people in the workforce in the resource area were engaged in or serviced agriculture, primarily ranching. The number has been declining for some time and can be expected to continue to do so. Income generated by ranching accounted for approximately 3 percent of total personal income in the area. Agriculture property assessments amount to approximately 3.3 percent of total assessed valuation.

Authority to develop rules and regulations for the orderly use, improvement, and development of public grazing lands was provided by the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 and succeeding amendments. The increasing diversity of use of the public lands led to the enactment in 1976 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Public Rangeland Improvement Act of 1978, both of which emphasize multiple use management of all resources and related values, such as wildlife habitat, watershed, energy development, and recreational opportunities as well as livestock grazing.

RELATION OF RANGELAND PROGRAM SUMMARY TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS

Management of the livestock grazing program was analyzed in the Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS satisfied the court mandate (Natural Resources Defense Council et al. versus Watt (Civil Action 1983-75)) requiring BLM to complete an EIS on its livestock grazing program.

Four alternatives for managing the public land resources, including livestock grazing, were analyzed in the EIS. The alternative selected for adoption by the BLM State Director is the draft EIS Preferred Alternative (called the Proposed Plan in the final EIS). This alternative is presented as the RMP in the BLM State Director's Record of Decision, dated January 3, 1984.

In the RMP, decisions were made on those questions raised during the planning process, such as how forage would be allocated between consumptive and nonconsumptive users and which lands would be managed for livestock forage production. The basic livestock grazing management program set forth in the RMP is compatible with all other resources.

To implement the decisions made in the RMP, allotment management plans (AMPs) and environmental assessments will need to be written. The AMPs will describe the grazing systems to be used. They will also describe the size, shape, and placement of range improvement projects. The environmental assessments will analyze the effects of implementing the AMPs and list mitigation to reduce impacts.

The EIS (both draft and final) and the RMP are available in the Glenwood Springs Resource Area office. Forthcoming AMPs and environmental assessments will also be available.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN DECISIONS

The objective of the livestock grazing program is to provide enough forage to meet the active preference of grazing permittees in the resource area. This would require 56,885 AUMs of forage for livestock. Management actions planned to reach the various resource objectives are set out in Chapter 2 of the RMP.

This section of the RPS explains the selective management category concept and describes how stocking rates will be determined and grazing decisions issued, how AMPs will be developed, and how the livestock grazing program will be monitored.

SELECTIVE MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES

Present grazing management policy required that allotments be placed into one of three management categories--improve, maintain, or custodial--based on range condition, resource production potential, resource conflicts or controversy, potential for positive economic return on investment, present management, and other criteria appropriate to the area. (More detailed explanations of these categories can be found on page 49, Chapter 3, of the final EIS and page 23, Chapter 2, of the RMP).

Allotments in the improve category are in less than optimal condition and are producing at less than their potential. They may have other resource conflicts, do have definite opportunities for positive economic return, and usually have some management problems. One hundred six allotments have been placed under this category.

Allotments in the maintain category are in satisfactory condition and are producing near their potential. They do not have serious resource conflicts, may have opportunities for positive economic return, and do not usually have management problems. Forty allotments have been placed under this category.

For allotments in the custodial category, range condition and potential are not usually considerations. These allotments have limited resource conflicts or controversy and present management is satisfactory or is the only logical practice under existing resource conditions. Opportunities for positive economic return on investment do not exist or are constrained by technological or economic considerations. When a majority of the land within an allotment is identified for disposal that allotment will be placed in the custodial category. The BLM will not normally expend funds on lands that are expected to pass from federal ownership. One hundred seven allotments have been placed under this category.

Allotments may be moved to a different category as more information is gathered or as conditions change. Any such moves will be documented in RPS updates with reasons for the move.

Management categories determine priorities for developing and funding AMPs and monitoring and performing use supervision. Allotments in the improve category have first priority, allotments in the maintain category have second priority, and allotments in the custodial category have third priority for AMP development. Priority for monitoring by category is first improve, second custodial, and third maintain.

Appendix 2 lists the specific criteria used to place allotments in their respective category.

STOCKING RATES AND GRAZING DECISIONS

The forage allocation decision in the RMP is to allocate 50 percent of the total available forage in the resource area to livestock and big game. The remaining 50 percent of the available forage and all vegetation not considered forage is to be allocated for small game and nongame wildlife use, watershed protection, and the plants' physiological maintenance needs.

Of the forage allocated for livestock and big game use, 45 percent, or approximately 38,000 AUMs, has been allocated for livestock use. Through implementation of the livestock grazing program, at least an additional 12,700 AUMs of livestock forage could be provided through vegetation manipulation projects and improved grazing management on 98 allotments where increases are needed.

The amount of forage estimated to be available for livestock and wildlife use is based on 1979 production survey estimates and an ecological condition class/estimated stocking rate program. However, actual stocking rates will be determined through monitoring with supplemental studies on 149 allotments where present data are thought to be inconclusive. See the monitoring section of this document for a discussion of the supplemental studies.

Once the stocking rate has been determined, whether through an agreement or following monitoring, and if a reduction is required, a minimum of 5 years will be allowed to reach the lower level of use. Reductions will be made the first, third, and fifth years following issuance of the final decision unless an agreement is reached with the permittee to shorten the period.

Therefore, until the amount of available forage is determined, the interim grazing use on allotments where data are inconclusive will be the active preference or the use agreed upon between the BLM and the permittee (see Appendix 1). Each of these levels could exceed the amount recommended in the RMP. However, most permittees probably will continue to graze at approximately the existing use levels shown in Appendix 1, which is generally below the present authorized grazing use.

The allocation column in Appendix 1 shows final and interim allocations. Final allocations were made where no reductions were required or where the permittees agreed to reductions. Interim allocations were made where 1979 production survey data estimates were inconclusive. These allotments are subject to change as more information is gathered. Any changes will be documented in RPS updates.

The livestock grazing management program in the RMP allows for continuation of grazing on all but three allotments (Appendix 1). Permittees on two of these allotments have decided not to graze their very steep allotments, and use on one allotment has been temporarily suspended until conditions improve sufficiently to allow resumption of livestock grazing. A fourth allotment is presently being monitored for an increased level of use.

No existing allotments were determined in the RMP to be totally unsuitable for livestock grazing. Additionally, approximately 756 AUMs are available on 24 unallotted allotments. However, in both the above cases, stocking rates may be so low on several allotments that livestock use may be impractical.

There were no allotments identified that required immediate grazing reductions to prevent resource degradation.

Grazing decisions for maintain category allotments will be issued by May 15, 1984; those for custodial category allotments will be issued by June 15, 1984; and those for improve category allotments will be issued by November 15, 1984. All final grazing decisions will contain the following information by allotment:

1. The reason for the action including reference to the pertinent terms, conditions, and/or provisions of the grazing regulations.
2. The recognized active grazing preference and any held in suspended nonuse.
3. The period of use.
4. The number and kind of livestock.
5. The percent public land in the allotment.
6. The permittees' or affected parties' right to protest and/or appeal.

In addition, decisions requiring adjustments in livestock grazing use will contain the following information:

1. The allocation of forage to livestock.
2. The specific schedule for implementing the adjustments.
3. The specific management objectives for the allotment.
4. The resource values to be evaluated to determine progress in meeting these objectives.
5. The changes in these values that would warrant a modification of the scheduled adjustments.
6. Other information necessary to set forth actions required to achieve the required management objectives for the allotment.

ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT

The BLM will work with livestock operators, local wildlife officials, and the local grazing advisory board in developing AMPs. The BLM will also work with other individuals or organizations who have an interest in specific allotments and who express that interest in writing to this office. AMPs will contain the grazing system to be used and describe the rangeland improvement projects that will have to be constructed. Priority for development of AMPs will be, first, to get existing AMPs fully operational and, second, to start developing new AMPs by management category. Within each category, priorities for development will be closely tied to benefit-cost analysis. Priority for development may be moved up if the permittee or other interested party is willing to contribute funds for development.

New AMP development in the near term will be directed at Beaver-Mamm (8401), Dry Hollow (8127), West Hardscrabble (8504), and Onion Ridge (8647) allotments. Future priorities for development will be specified in RPS updates.

Each AMP will select a grazing system that best suits the vegetation, soil, climate, types of animals that graze each allotment, and ranchers' operational requirements and meets objectives identified in the RMP. The selected grazing system will minimize adverse environmental impacts and resource conflicts. Some allotments will continue to be grazed under an existing grazing system while others may be placed under a different system.

Rangeland improvement projects will facilitate livestock management, improve vegetation health and vigor, and provide more forage for livestock and wildlife. Appendix A of the RMP discusses grazing systems and lists range improvements that can be used in the livestock grazing management program.

The type, number, and location of projects will be determined for each AMP as it is developed. Each AMP and project will undergo a site-specific environmental assessment and benefit-cost analysis and will be subject to the management stipulations detailed in Appendix B of the RMP. Table 1 shows the number of projects associated with a typical 5,000-acre allotment, based on 8 existing AMPs. Not all allotments will receive this much rangeland improvement work. Most will not.

Table 1. Typical Allotment Range Improvement Projects

Fence (miles)	Cattleguard	Corral	Stocktrail (miles)	Reservoir	Spring	Pipeline (miles)	Vegetation Manipulation (acres)	Seeding (acres)
10	1	1	.25	5	5	.75	400	100

Each AMP must be cost effective with the possible exception of certain range improvements in areas of heavy resource damage or those that are privately funded. AMP development is tied to the BLM budgeting process. Present budget projections allow approximately two AMPs to be implemented per year.

The livestock grazing program allows for construction of rangeland improvements and land treatment projects whether funded by BLM, private contributions, or both. The program requires close coordination between BLM and grazing permittees to assure mutual understanding of both parties' objectives for the grazing program and of how to accomplish them within the constraints of the RMP. Coordination is also necessary to assure that monitoring, especially forage utilization studies, is done accurately and timely.

MONITORING

The livestock grazing program will be monitored to establish stocking rates where necessary and to determine if it is accomplishing program objectives. The following studies will be used in monitoring.

1. Actual Use. Permittees will record and report the number of stock and days used for each allotment with spot checks by BLM.

2. Utilization (the percent of a plant's annual growth removed by grazing animals). Studies will be made in key areas when livestock are removed from the allotment. The key forage plant method will be used.

3. Range Trend. Photographs and measurements of trend in range conditions, ground cover, and plant composition will be made in key areas.

4. Climate. Precipitation and temperature from official weather stations and BLM sampling will be correlated with other data.

Additionally, browse transects to determine utilization of browse plants and pellet group transects to determine the trend in the number of deer or elk days use per acre will be established on some allotments.

Monitoring to Determine Stocking Rates

Monitoring studies to determine stocking rates will consist of at least actual use, utilization, and climate. These will be conducted annually until BLM is confident enough of the data interpretation to issue a final decision. Until then, grazing will continue at active preference levels or at a reduced level agreed upon through consultation with the permittee. Browse and pellet group transects may be used to help determine stocking rates. BLM, in consultation with permittees, has already established key areas and utilization transects on 89 allotments. The remaining allotments will be covered as necessary in the coming years. These data will continue to be collected after stocking rates are set but less frequently.

Monitoring to Determine Program Objectives

Monitoring to determine if BLM is accomplishing program objectives over the long term will consist of range trend studies. Range trend studies will be the primary method used to evaluate long-term livestock grazing management actions. Trend studies have already been established on 25 allotments and will be established on additional allotments in the future. Trend transects will be read approximately 8 years after they are established and in conjunction with grazing system cycles.

Each resource will be monitored to determine if its specific activities are achieving its stated objectives or if proper mitigation measures have not been included. Livestock grazing management will primarily be monitored through actual use, climate, forage utilization, and trend studies. However, it may also be monitored along with water quality, aquatic, or riparian studies, for instance. Also, allotments will be evaluated as conditions change or more data are available to determine whether they should be moved to another selective management category.

The BLM will monitor forage use and season of use by both livestock and big game on the 53 allotments listed on page 27, Chapter 2, of the RMP to determine if seasonal use restrictions for livestock are necessary to prevent excessive competition between livestock and big game.

How Monitoring Will Be Implemented

The monitoring studies column in Appendix 1 shows what studies are in place for monitoring during the 1984 grazing year. Studies on 89 allotments include 110 trend and 153 utilization transects established on 153 key areas. In addition, browse/pellet group transects have been established on 25 allotments in the more important big game areas. Permittees will be asked to begin submitting actual use reports in 1984.

These studies are located on allotments with existing AMPs, allotments with potential for AMP development, and allotments where data show there is most potential for livestock reductions. Budgetary constraints preclude monitoring all allotments. Allotments without studies in place do not have range or resource conditions or data indicating need for livestock reductions.

Allotments with interim allocations were also screened for recent history of non-use when decisions were made in placing studies. Delay in establishing studies will not have adverse consequences. Utilization and trend studies will be established on all allotments where stocking rate information is not adequate on a priority basis over the next several years.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Various public workshops and meetings were held initially to inform the general public of the BLM planning process and allow them to identify the issues to be addressed. Workshops were held to present the proposed alternatives for the draft EIS and to solicit comments. A public hearing was also held to receive comments on the draft EIS. A summary of these meetings is as follows:

November-December 1979	Grand Junction, Rifle, Glenwood Springs, Eagle, McCoy, Denver	Workshops to Identify Planning Issues
May 1982	Grand Junction, Rifle, Glenwood Springs, Eagle, McCoy, Denver	Explain and Solicit Comments on Alternatives for Draft EIS
December 1982	Grand Junction, Denver, Glenwood Springs	Public Hearings on Draft EIS

In addition to these public meetings, a 90-day comment period was held on the draft EIS to allow for written comments. Four newsletters detailing progression of the plan were mailed to those who expressed an interest in receiving them.

Opportunities for additional public involvement will come during development of AMPs.

APPENDIX 1
LIVESTOCK USE AND MONITORING STUDIES BY CATEGORY AND ALLOTMENT

Allotment Number and Name		Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3]		Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
					Final	Interim	
IMPROVE CATEGORY							
Garfield Capability Unit							
8001	Sample	260	15	15	0		A/U
8002	Reed	710	49	0	28		A/U
8003	Kissel	640	44	24	36		2
8006	Cedar Mountain	6,060	255	129	255		2
8007	Rifle	1,880	76	15	76		2
8008	Jackson	320	31	6		31	1
8009	Weaver	4,260	300	180		300	A/U/T/B/P
8010	East Cedar Mountain	2,180	128	96		128	A/U/T/B/P
8011	Middle Rifle	927	60	35		60	1
8012	Brush Creek Common	4,120	396	275		396	1
8013	Harris Gulch	2,277	1,138	275		1,138	A/U
8016	Southwest Rifle Creek	1,370	371	53		371	A/U
8018	Horse Mountain-Brush Creek	4,170	1,095	365		1,095	A/U/T
8019	Morrow	729	74	59		74	A/U
8024	Ryden	1,240	88	88		88	A/U
8025	Dodo	2,340	36	29	31		2
8026	Hogback Common	1,960	350	265		350	A/U/T
8032	Elk Park Common	2,200	271	29		271	A/U/T
8039	Government Creek Common	7,580	991	296		991	A/U/T/B/P
8046	Jackson Gulch	2,160	150	90		150	A/U
8201	Kaiser Hells Hole	1,160	29	23	18		2
8202	Possum Creek	1,970	417	266		417	A/U

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name	Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3] Final	Allocation (AUMs)[3] Interim	Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
8203 Storm King	4,650	272	178	272		2
8204 Storm King-Dolan Gulch	280	9	2		9	1
8207 Canyon Creek	1,400	146	130	146		2
8208 Bearwallow and Jolley	3,370	665	507		665	1
8209 Bearwallow-Jolley-Harris	1,000	114	84		114	A/U
8210 Boiler Creek	2,520	70	85	70		2
8101 Kamm Mesa	920	56	8		56	1
8102 Whitman	790	63	63		63	1
8104 Beaver-Mamm Common	3,946	632	596		632	A/U/T
*8105 East Divide Common	13,628	2,331	947		2,331	A/U/T
8113 Beaver Creek	600	41	41	41		2
8114 Franks	320	9	8	9		2
8119 Porcupine Common	1,197	288	219		288	A/U
8125 Dry Creek Pete and Bill	7,948	372	207		372	1
8127 Dry Hollow-Reservoir Gulch	6,956	759	401		759	A/U/T
8130 Alkali Creek Common	1,645	200	133		200	A/U
*8213 Vulcan	1,977	161	118		161	A/U/T
8218 Horse Creek	1,237	84	0	84		A/U/T
8220 Lower Garfield Common	920	83	41		83	A/U
8221 Hilton Individual	360	12	9	12		A/U
*8222 Upper Garfield Common	4,957	1,496	1,031		1,496	A/U/T
8901 Magpie Creek	1,947	56	46	56		2
8902 Webster Park	7,133	700	309	566		2
8903 Hubbard Mesa	5,980	760	382		760	A/U
8905 Doodlebug	920	45	27	37		2
8907 Rees	3,647	475	275	475		2
*8908 JQS Common	10,176	3,963	2,624		3,963	A/U/T
*8910 East Fork Common	8,432	2,064	1,707		2,064	A/U/T

8913	Mahaffey Summer	3,400	684	456		684	A/U
8914	Old Mountain	1,325	399	245		399	A/U/T
8920	Riley Gulch	1,473	123	87		123	1
8922	Smith Gulch	2,320	200	121		200	1
	Subtotal	158,767	23,696	13,700	2,212	20,911	
	Roaring Fork Capability Unit						
8205	Mitchell-Oasis	2,080	154	130	154		2
8206	Oasis Creek	1,440	100	58	100		2
8212	Paradise Creek	2,290	200	200	200		2
8217	South Canyon	2,399	300	135		300	1
8302	Cattle Creek Driveway	643	180	175		180	A/U/T
8308	Driveway Common	1,000	300	123		300	A/U
8316	West Basalt Mountain	2,090	286	186		286	1
8320	Sutey	730	55	44		55	A/U/B/P
8321	Strook Individual	280	54	1		54	A/U/B/P
8323	Diamond Flats Common	1,920	589	242		589	A/U
8324	Driveway	840	386	170		386	1
8334	Crown Common	2,700	344	329	344		A/U/T
8335	Crown	1,370	267	90		267	A/U/T
8336	Vasten Homestead Common	770	243	241		243	A/U/T
8337	Crown Individual	871	151	75	122		A/U
8339	Fender Individual	540	65	65	65		2
8340	Cerise	720	108	43	108		2
8341	Prince Creek	2,040	337	160		337	A/U/T/B/P
8342	Crystal River	3,985	445	89		445	A/U/T/B/P
8343	Thompson Creek	3,230	243	0		243	1
8344	Mount Sopris	440	32	31		32	1
8346	Thomas	1,020	83	79	83		2
8348	North Thompson Creek Common	3,415	593	457		593	1
8352	Stevenson	1,715	90	54		90	A/B/P
	Subtotal	38,528	5,605	3,177	1,176	3,955	

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name	Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3]		Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
				Final	Interim	
Eagle-Vail Capability Unit						
8502 East Hardscrabble Common	7,614	870	685	870		A/U/T/B/P
8504 West Hardscrabble	14,642	1,157	822		1,157	A/U/T/B/P
8506 Cottonwood Creek Etc.	9,107	787	747	787		A/B/P
8507 Red Hill Common	11,936	628	583		628	A/U/T
8508 Cottonwood Creek	1,030	80	80		80	A/U
8707 Ute Creek	3,090	266	106		266	A/U
8712 North Bellyache	2,460	180	180		180	A/U
8721 Salt Creek-Bellyache	4,260	249	241		249	A/U/T/B/P
Subtotal	54,139	4,217	3,444	1,657	2,560	
Castle Peak Capability Unit						
8606 Piskey	11,074	430	155	430		A/U/T
8616 Deer Pen	7,670	900	406	703		A/U/T
8639 Upper Cottonwood	1,120	214	171	149		A/U/T
8641 Greenhorn	10,839	860	517		860	A/U/T
*8642 Trail Gulch	13,577	321	128	321		A/U/T
*8643 Blowout	18,791	535	379	535		A/U/T
8702 Wolcott	6,050	974	263		974	A/U
*8730 Bocco Mountain	4,040	290	250		290	A/U/T/B/P
*8731 Cabin Gulch	3,331	340	336		340	A/U/T
Subtotal	76,492	4,864	2,605	2,138	2,464	

King Mountain Capability Unit							
8506	Cottonwood Creek (Burnt Ridge)	1,950	168	168		168	1
8602	H and H Individual	3,720	76	30	29		A/U/B/P
8614	Spring Creek	2,340	125	125		125	A/U/B/P
8632	Upper Little Sheep Creek	960	153	71		153	A/U
8634	Three Springs	1,100	60	48		60	1
8647	Onion Ridge	7,800	477	372		477	A/U/T/B/P
8648	Upper Coffeepot	837	72	44		72	A/U
8649	Lower Coffeepot	4,541	324	224		324	A/U/B/P
8661	L and H	4,349	343	343		343	A/U/B/P
8662	Black Mountain	987	109	109		109	1
8666	Visintainer	4,105	488	488		488	A/U
8672	Luark	2,467	127	127	—	127	A/U/B/P
	Subtotal	35,156	2,522	2,149	29	2,446	
	Total (Improve Category)	363,082	40,904	25,075	7,212	32,336	
MAINTAIN CATEGORY							
Garfield Capability Unit							
8005	Doak	370	83	63		51	4
8014	Graham	190	26	24	26		6
8015	Hayden	168	88	88		188	A/U
8021	Watts	800	183	183		183	A/U
8022	Simpson and Nichols	430	105	105		105	4
8037	Scutter Gulch	440	16	16		16	4
8228	Canyon Creek	730	51	51		51	4
8106	Scott	938	120	44		120	4
8107	Dean Gulch	865	126	76		126	A/U
8108	Smith (lease)	148	18	10	18		6
8117	Pitman	1,125	146	140	146		6

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name		Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3]		Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
					Final	Interim	
8118	Couey 2	40	18	17	18		6
8121	Spruce Gulch Common	1,089	174	97	174		6
8124	Battlement Creek Common	2,643	303	152	303		6
8126	Pole Creek and Cottonwood	960	115	79	115		6
8128	Middle Mamm Creek	2,215	163	158	163		6
8129	Upper Wallace Common	2,591	160	91	160		6
8214	Alkali Creek	960	168	112	132		6
8216	Delaney	445	60	42	60		6
8219	Bair	440	61	21		61	A/U/T
8224	Hilton-Porter Common	900	180	182		180	4
8909	Clough-Alber	5,287	1,090	724	1,090		6
	Subtotal	25,954	3,454	2,475	2,405	981	
Roaring Fork Capability Unit							
8301	Cottonwood	880	552	264		552	A/U/T
8306	Gould	240	101	43		101	4
8309	Homestead	120	60	12	26		6
8310	Lower Place	160	64	64		64	4
8313	Lookout Mountain	3,270	301	0	301		6
8328	Wheatley	2,150	84	29		84	4
8329	Fender	920	67	60	67		6
8331	Light	1,665	262	167	262		6
	Subtotal	9,405	1,491	639	656	801	

Eagle-Vail Capability Unit		--	--	--	--	--	--
Subtotal		0	0	0	0	0	
Castle Peak Capability Unit							
*8601	East Castle	9,307	2,316	2,799	2,316		A/U/T
8619	Catamount Common	6,601	886	886	886		A/U/T
8620	West Castle Common	5,340	522	522	522		A/U/T
8625	Bull Gulch Common	9,726	360	360	360		6
8638	Eiby Creek	1,680	112	38	112		6
*8733	Domantle	120	65	52		65	4
Subtotal		32,774	4,261	4,657	4,196	65	
King Mountain Capability Unit							
8633	Upper Hack Creek	3,000	300	120	300		6
8654	Benton	1,462	162	162	162		6
8665	Strubi	203	30	30	30		6
Subtotal		4,665	492	312	492	0	
Total (Maintain Category)		72,798	9,698	8,083	7,749	1,847	
CUSTODIAL CATEGORY							
Garfield Capability Unit							
8004	Bowen Isolated Tracts	160	38	35	23		5
8017	Lundgren-Hogback	1,080	121	86		121	A/U/T/B/P
8020	Coal Mine	80	14	0		14	3

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name	Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3]		Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
				Final	Interim	
8023 Government Creek Isolated	80	8	8		8	3
8027 Roberts	130	22	18		22	3
8028 Red Mountain	1,000	44	29	44		5
8029 Pretti-Roberts	1,696	394	124		394	A/U
8030 Castle	1,410	60	40		60	3
8031 Hill	440	43	34		43	3
8033 Brosius Gulch	1,390	75	30		75	3
8034 Harvey Gap 1	947	54	8		54	3
8035 Harvey Gap 2	2,120	180	16		180	3
8036 Jewell	480	32	32		32	3
8038 Wittwer	80	4	4	2		5
8211 Dietz	920	45	30	45		5
8259 Possum Creek Driveway	510	45	16		45	3
8103 Oates	1,150	40	19	38		5
8110 Kinney Brothers Individual	80	6	4		6	3
8111 Shideler	160	14	14		14	3
8112 Grass Mesa	640	49	49		49	3
8115 Couey 1	160	4	4		4	3
8116 Shideler Individual	95	8	8		8	3
8120 Porcupine Individual	155	28	0		28	3
8122 Smith	360	98	98		98	3
8123 Hoaglund	320	17	17	17		5
8131 Alkali Gulch	1,145	160	113		160	A/U
8215 Larsen	145	8	6	8		5
8225 Hilton 1	1,800	95	76		95	3
8226 Hilton 2	40	7	6	7		5

8227	Skeen	160	25	15		25	3
8904	Home Ranch	862	0	0		0	U/T
8912	Sharrade Park	2,236	23	0	23		5
8916	Crawford and Kerlee	695	10	8		10	5
8917	Starkey Gulch	247	77	61		77	3
8918	Wheeler Gulch	600	124	45		124	3
8919	Callahan Mountain Common	1,777	96	30	80		5
8923	Mahaffey Winter 1 and 2	6,319					
8924	Mahaffey Winter 3 (Combined)	9,591	678	617	—	678	3
	Subtotal	40,266	2,746	1,700	287	2,375	
Roaring Fork Capability Unit							
8303	Bianco	80	6	6	6		5
8304	Upper Place	40	24	3		24	3
8305	Squires	40	3	3	3		5
8307	Coryell	80	13	8	13		5
8311	Prectel	90	60	12	16		5
8312	Hopkins	240	20	20	20		5
8314	Heuschkel	280	28	22	28		5
8315	Doyal	80	10	10	10		5
8317	Haff Ranch	280	24	12		24	3
8318	Badlands	640	75	0		75	3
8322	Rodgers	100	19	4		19	3
8327	Fryingpan	950	72	14		72	3
8338	Driveway Common	240	93	88		93	3
8347	Potato Bill	220	16	13	16		5
8349	Red Canyon	520	90	68		80	3
8350	Little Woody Creek	480	99	77		99	3
8402	Cantly Homestead	500	17	17	17		5
8411	Snowmass Creek	23	20	20	13	—	5
	Subtotal	4,881	689	329	142	414	

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name		Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3]		Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
					Final	Interim	
Eagle-Vail Capability Unit							
8501	Third Gulch	538	25	25	25		5
8503	Brush Creek	100	9	3	9		5
8505	Eagle River	80	16	12		16	3
8710	Wolcott Isolated Tract	214	40	16		40	3
8716	Williams Individual	230	30	6	30		5
8718	Lake Creek	160	18	11		18	3
8719	Horse Creek	320	44	44		44	3
8720	Fenno	200	25	23		25	3
8722	Salt Creek-Forest	780	64	56	29		5
8723	Falk	80	9	9	9		5
8734	Bellyache	685	18	2		18	3
Subtotal		3,387	298	207	102	161	
Castle Peak Capability Unit							
8604	Detweiler	20	36	36	36		5
8605	River-Catamount	1,569	75	75	75		5
8607	Wheelock Individual Large	11	43	18	43		5
8608	Wheelock Individual Small	7	9	5	9		5
8609	Castle Creek Individual	840	170	170	170		5
8617	Newcomer	100	4	4	4		5
8621	Castle	60	15	15	15		5
8622	West Castle Peak	100	7	4	7		5

8623	East Castle Peak	160	48	21	48		5
8701	Piney Creek	240	45	10		45	3
*8732	Diamond J	880	26	3		26	A/B/P
*8735	Hells Hole	645	34	8		34	3
	Subtotal	4,539	512	369	407	105	
King Mountain Capability Unit							
8603	Tepee Creek	3,408	27	27		27	A/U/B/P
8610	East Sunnyside	407	20	19		20	3
8611	Sunnyside Individual	3,647	100	100		100	A/U
8612	West Sunnyside	823	24	23		24	A/U
8613	Sunnyside	702	25	25		25	3
8615	River Common	3,260	38	38	38		5
8618	Derby Ridge	340	40	27		40	3
8626	Red Dirt	3,080	50	50		50	A/B/P
8627	Sugarloaf	200	50	24	50		5
8628	Sheep Creek (Colorado Division of Wildlife)	6,870	--	--		--	B/P
8629	Willow Creek	3,190	126	57	62		A/B/P
8630	Irrigated Land-Trail Gulch	20	132	79	132		5
8631	Horse Creek	2,600	76	16		76	3
8635	Mooney	120	30	24		30	3
8636	McKeen Creek	360	105	84		105	3
8637	South McKeen Creek	40	8	4	8		5
8644	Moniger Ridge	298	34	26	34		5
8645	Upper and Lower Jack Spring	65	50	47		50	3
8646	Moniger Ridge Skiff	298	27	27	27		5
8653	Albertson	1,646	186	186		186	A/U
8655	Dude	131	4	4		4	3
8656	Gates	160	13	13		13	3
8657	Hastings	280	7	7		7	3
8658	Holt	2,233	105	105		105	3
8659	Horn	2,272	249	249		249	A/U

APPENDIX 1 Continued

Allotment Number and Name	Acreage	Present Authorized Livestock Use (AUMs)[1]	Existing Use (AUMs)[2]	Allocation (AUMs)[3] Final	Allocation (AUMs)[3] Interim	Monitoring Studies or Priority for Studies[4]
8663 McSweeney	1,081	53	53	53		5
8667 Bambi	2,373	42	42	42		5
8668 Copper Spur	1,375	211	211	—	211	A/U
Subtotal	41,279	1,842	1,541	446	1,322	
Total (Custodial Category)	94,354	6,077	4,144	1,097	4,377	
Grand Total	530,234	56,679	37,304	16,058	38,560	

Note: Allocation figures and the allotment category are subject to change as more information is gathered concerning production and allotment condition or as conditions change. Any such changes will be documented in RPS updates, the first of which will be published approximately 1 year following this document.

[1] Active preference. The number of AUMs presently authorized whether active or nonuse.

[2] The 5-year average licensed use 1975-79.

[3] Final allocation where no reductions are necessary or where an agreement has been reached; Interim allocation where monitoring to determine proper stocking rates is necessary.

[4] A=actual use, U=forage utilization, T=trend, B=browse utilization, and P=pellet groups. These studies are in place and will be the minimum amount checked in 1984. Climatic data from local sources will also be used. The numbers 1-6 indicate the allotment priority group for establishing monitoring studies over the next several years. Group 1 will be completed before moving to group 2, and so on.

*Allotments presently under AMP.

APPENDIX 2
SELECTIVE MANAGEMENT CATEGORY CRITERIA

1. Range Condition. Ecological condition classes based on range site condition mapping and personal knowledge. Excellent and good condition are satisfactory; fair and poor condition are unsatisfactory.

2. Allotment Potential Productivity. Based on estimated forage production and anticipated increases possible through vegetation manipulation practices on suitable areas. Expressed in acres per AUM with 1 to 7 acres per AUM being high potential, 8 to 15 acres per AUM being medium potential, and greater than 15 acres per AUM being low potential.

3. Allotment Present Productivity. Based on estimated forage production expressed in acres per AUM with same quantification as above for high, medium, and low classes.

4. Resource Use Conflicts. Other resource uses that livestock grazing management actions may conflict with such as wildlife winter range, threatened or endangered species, or cultural resources. Expressed as many (5 or more) few (1 to 4), or none.

5. Controversy. How controversial are the resource use conflicts identified above. Magnitude will be based on interest expressed by the public and resource specialists' knowledge. Expressed as high, low, or none.

6. Present Management. Indicated somewhat by range condition and present productivity relative to potential productivity. Factors to consider are condition and apparent trend, if available; kind of stock; season of use; stock distribution; and management facilities. This includes both BLM administration and ranchers' livestock management. Expressed as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

7. Prudent Investor's Willingness to Invest. Use the "Prudent Investor" test from Washington Office Instruction Memorandum No. 83-27. Compare rough estimates of costs and benefits and ask if you would invest your money. Expressed as yes, no, or maybe. "Yes" meets criteria for improve category, "no" for custodial, and "maybe" requires more data or could indicate a maintain category allotment.

8. Disposal Zones. How much, if any, of the allotment falls within a disposal zone. If the majority of the allotment does, it normally would indicate a custodial category.

9. Other. Other items to consider, if needed, are access to the allotment, prospective reductions, if any, and any prior commitments to the permittee.

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 50, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225